Case 1:08-cv-05901-JFK Document 233 Filed 06/30/14 Page 1 of 2

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.

A REGISTERED LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

I 5TH FLOOR

560 LEXINGTON AVENUE

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-6828

(212) 336-8330

FAX (212) 336-8340

WWW.SUSMANGODFREY.COM

SUITE 5 | 00 | 1000 Louisiana Street | Houston, Texas 77002-5096 | (7 | 3) 65 | -9366

SUITE 5 | 00 90 | MAIN STREET DALLAS, TEXAS 75202-3775 (2 | 4) 754-1900 SUITE 950 I 90 I AVENUE OF THE STARS LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067-6029 (3 I 0) 789-3 I 00 SUITE 3800 I 20 | THIRD AVENUE SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98 | 0 | -3000 (206) 5 | 6-3880

SHAWN J. RABIN
DIRECT DIAL (212) 471-8347

E-Mail srabin@susmangodfrey.com

June 30, 2014

VIA ECF

Honorable John F. Keenan United States District Judge United States District Court Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street New York, NY 10007

Re: Coreolis Holdings, Inc., et al. v. George Soros, et al. (10-cv-8175); and TradeWinds Airlines, Inc. v. George Soros, et al. (08-cv-5901)

Dear Judge Keenan:

We represent plaintiff TradeWinds Airlines, Inc. ("TradeWinds") in this consolidated veil-piercing action and submit *Propst v. North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services*, -- S.E.2d --, 2014 WL 2480188 (N.C. App. June 3, 2014), as supplemental authority to the pending motion for summary judgment. Co-plaintiffs, Coreolis Holdings, Inc. and TradeWinds Holdings, Inc. (collectively, "Coreolis"), join this letter.

In our Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, we noted that a recent North Carolina Court of Appeals' decision declined to follow the Restatement (Second) of Judgments, consistent with North Carolina Supreme Court precedent. *See* Opp. Brief at 31-32 (citing *Tong v. Dunn*, 752 S.E.2d 669, 675 (N.C. App. 2013) (explaining how the North Carolina Supreme Court declined to adopt the Restatement (Second) of Judgment's transactional approach to res judicata)).

This month, the North Carolina Court of Appeals once again refused to adopt a section of the Restatement (Second) of Judgments: "We decline to follow the approach of the Second Restatement as to this issue because it is incompatible with the doctrine of collateral estoppel as it has been applied in this state." *Propst*, 2014 WL 2480188 at *3 (emphasis added). Because this decision was issued after our opposition brief was due, we are submitting it with this notice.

Honorable John F. Keenan Southern District of New York June 30, 2014 Page 2

Sincerely,

Shawn J. Rabin

cc: All Parties